

Jaafar M., Ismail S. and Rasoolimanesh S. M.

PERCEIVED SOCIAL EFFECTS OF TOURISM DEVELOPMENT: A CASE STUDY OF KINABALU NATIONAL PARK

PERCEIVED SOCIAL EFFECTS OF TOURISM DEVELOPMENT: A CASE STUDY OF KINABALU NATIONAL PARK

Mastura JAAFAR

Professor, School of Housing, Building, and Planning, Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800, Minden, Penang, Malaysia
masturaj@usm.my

Safura ISMAIL

School of Housing, Building, and Planning, Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800, Minden, Penang, Malaysia
safuraismail@ymail.com

S. Mostafa RASOOLIMANESH

School of Housing, Building, and Planning, Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800, Minden, Penang, Malaysia
mostafa@usm.my

Abstract

We investigate the perceived social effects of tourism development on local communities from the perspective of local residents in selected locations near Kinabalu National Park. Local residents (n=378) were surveyed using a questionnaire and the collected data subjected to a series of descriptive analysis methods. Most respondents indicated that tourism, aside from being a stimulus for various cultural activities, had significantly increased their and other local people's pride in their national and local culture. Additionally, respondents indicated that community facilities had been improved as a result of tourism, and that their quality of life had also significantly improved. Paradoxically, the results indicated several negative effects, such as congestion and the exposure of anti-social behavior to the local community. However, the findings revealed that most local residents believed that the positive effects of tourism outweighed the negative. Obstacles to the sustainable Management of tourism in Kinabalu National Park must be overcome through the combined efforts of key stakeholders involved in tourism, including government and local authorities. The participation of the local community is an essential part of this bridging process because their involvement helps to protect and conserve the area as a tourist attraction. Moreover, participation can also help overcome negative social effects.

Keywords: Positive perceived social effects, negative perceived social effect, tourism development, residents' perceptions, local community, sustainable tourism.

1. INTRODUCTION

According to the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) (2010), tourism is forecasted to grow at a rate in excess of 4% annually over the next 10 years and will account for 9.4% of the Gross World

Product (GWP); making tourism one of the fastest growing industries (UNWTO, 2006). Contributing to this forecast is the ever increasing number of new tourism destinations which belie the substantial investments having been made in the tourism sector ensuring that the industry becomes a key driver of socio-economic progress. This makes tourism development one of the largest and most dynamically developing sectors of external economic activity (Mirbabayev and Shagzatova, 2006).

Tourism is a social, cultural, and economic phenomenon entailing the movement of people to countries or places outside their usual environment for personal or business/professional purposes (World Trade Organization, 2008). Ecotourism is one of the fastest growing sectors of the global tourism industry (Eagles, 2002). Ecotourism is an enlightening nature travel experience that contributes to the conservation of the ecosystem while respecting the integrity of host communities (Wight, 1993). Ecotourism relies on natural phenomena in relatively undisturbed sites (Hall and Boyd, 2005), such as national parks. Tourist agencies report that the demand for tourism in nature increases 10% to 25% annually (Hellenic Tourism Organization, 2000). Tourist spots with natural attractions and which offer ecotourism represent a new type of tourism experience and is often promoted through local and regional plans.

Malaysia has great potential in nature tourism and ecotourism (Backhaus, 2003). The tropical rainforests of Malaysia are among the oldest and most diverse ecosystems in the world (Khalifah and Tahir, 1997). National parks, established for preservation, enable and encourage access to education, recreation, and tourism. Kinabalu National Park is located in East Malaysia, in the state of Sabah, near Kota Kinabalu. Kinabalu National Park was first recognized as a national park in 1964. The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) designated Kinabalu National Park as a World Heritage Site (WHS) in 2000.

Products and services designed to meet tourist needs are provided by the local community, the profits from which form part of the local community's income. Nillahut (2010) argues that the provision of comfort, harmony, and support for the cultural, social, and environmental aspects of the community, as well as a high quality of life for residents must be at the cornerstone of actual development plans. However, if tourism is poorly developed, planned, and managed, it can reduce the effectiveness of these positive activities (Jashveer et al., 2011) and can thus either positively or negatively affect the local community (Jackson, 2008).

Pizam and Milman (1984) describe the social and cultural effects of tourism as the ways by which tourism influences changes in the value systems, individual behaviors, family relationships, collective lifestyles, moral conduct, creative expressions, traditional ceremonies, and community organizations of

destination communities. Kozak (2002) found that discussions concerning the cultural effects of tourism often overlap with discussions regarding the social effects of tourism. As with moral impacts, the distinction between the cultural and social effects of tourism are often blurred, hence the tendency to consider them together. Notwithstanding, various researchers and academics have formulated distinctive terms to identify the social effect of tourism, and different authors have provided diverse perspectives on what these socio-cultural effects involve.

Sharpley (1994) observes that the social effects of tourism can be significant, immediate, and visible in destination communities. These effects can manifest as a result of the development of the tourism industry itself or from tourist–host interactions. Moreover, Hall and Page (2003) note that these effects can result in changes to both collective and individual value systems, behavior patterns, community structures, lifestyles, and quality of life.

Following the Malaysian government’s extensive tourism campaign beginning in the 1990s, there was an almost immediate effect on local communities as a result of tourism development. Incoming tourists facilitated social interactions between visitors and the local community. However, MacDonald and Jolliffe (2003) highlight a number of concerns arising out of inappropriate tourism development which can have adverse environmental and social effects; including exposing locals to tourist behaviors which might clash with their culture and traditional community values. Local communities are exposed to negative and positive phenomena as a result of tourism. Effects are regarded as being negative when they disrupt societal components and as positive when associated with upgrading vital attributes.

Therefore, destination communities struggle with a critical dilemma over the regarding the costs and benefits of tourism development (Sharpley, 2014). If community residents perceive that the benefits and positive impact of tourism on local community outweighs the costs, they tend to be more satisfied with the tourism development and this in turn contributes toward the success and sustainability of the tourism development (Jurowski et al., 1997; Sharpley, 2014; Wang and Pfister, 2008). Consequently, evaluating how the impacts of tourism are perceived by host residents is vital if a tourism development project is to be sustainable. The current study aims to investigate these positive and negative social effects and how they are perceived from the perspective of host residents in the vicinity of the Kinabalu National Park WHS.

2. CASE STUDY

The Kinabalu National Park WHS is located in Sabah, East Malaysia, and covers an area of 753.7 km². Kinabalu National Park was recognized as a WHS in 2000 having satisfied two criteria. Firstly, Kinabalu

National Park possesses outstanding ecological and biological processes for terrestrial evolution and development; freshwater, coastal, and marine ecosystems, and communities of plants and animals. And secondly, Kinabalu National Park provides natural habitats for the in situ conservation of biological diversity, including endangered species of outstanding universal value from the perspective of science and conservation.

The main entrance to Kinabalu National Park is the Park Headquarters, located approximately 92 km from the state capital, Kota Kinabalu. The park has six substations and one control post, all of which are strategically located to maximize the effectiveness of the park's management and monitoring and to enhance recreational access. Aside from the park's major attraction, Mount Kinabalu, the Poring Hot Springs and Mesilau Nature Resort attract a substantial number of visitors to the park each year. One indicator of the total number of visitors to Kinabalu National Park is the number of visitors entering each substation. Among the six substations, Kinabalu Park Headquarters received the highest number of visitors at 341,310 and Mesilau at 22,910 the lowest number out of a total 550,826 visitors in 2011 (Jaafar et al., 2013).

The increasing number of tourists has changed the physical landscape of the area surrounding Kinabalu National Park. As developments at a destination trigger geographic, economic, political, and social changes, the entire atmosphere of the tourism destination itself is significantly affected; this in turn triggers further changes in the host community. This process of tourism destination development is illustrated in the life cycle model (Stansfield, 2006). Life cycle theory deals with the sale of new destination products, and how tourism destinations develop and change over time according to development phases. Understanding the life cycle concept is essential for those concerned about the development of destination area tourism policies (Kim, 2002).

Butler's (2006) tourist area life cycle model proposes that tourism destinations transition through six developmental stages of exploration, involvement, development, consolidation, stagnation, and decline. Based on this theory, Kinabalu National Park is currently in its development stage, with an increasing number of tourist arrivals annually. Hong and Yusoff (2010) report that the number of visitor arrivals to Kinabalu National Park increased from 829 in 1965 to over 550,826 in 2011 (Jaafar et al., 2013). International visitors comprised 22% of the total arrivals. As a result of this increasing number of tourist arrivals, the local community provides a range of products and services to cater to the needs of these visitors. Income earned through these endeavors contributes to the economic development of the local community, thereby fundamentally changing the community itself and propelling the destination further through the life cycle model.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1. Local community and tourism development

Local communities are significantly affected by tourism development. The local community is ultimately the point of origin for the supply of accommodation, catering, information, transport, facilities, and services for visiting tourists (Godfrey and Clarke, 2000). Various terms have appeared throughout the academic tourism literature to refer to the local community; such as locals, natives, residents, indigenous people, destination people, or hosts (Rahman, 2010). Bradshaw (2008) defines a community as a place historically sharing boundaries with one's geographic place of residence. A community is a group of individuals living or working within the same geographic area with some shared aspects of culture or common interests; they have a sense of belongingness with their fellow members, and try to satisfy their social, economic, political, and psychological needs (Rahman, 2010). This emphasis on geography in the definition of community is essential to understanding how community development is linked to the ability of a community to affect tourism development.

Local communities have been involved in tourism activities since time immemorial (McIntosh et al., 1995), although their earnest involvement in tourism development has only a recent history stretching back about two decades (Brohman, 1996). Nonetheless, the participation of local communities in tourism is seen as a positive force for change, acting as a catalyst for development (Claiborne, 2010). Kreag (2001) argues that regardless of community involvement, tourism can have either a positive or negative effect on a host community, and these effects will invariably differ among communities. Thus, tourism affects local communities through economic, social, cultural, ecological, environmental, and political forces (Singh et. al, 2003).

3.2. Perceived Social Effect of Tourism Development

How local residents perceive tourism development has a significant impact on the sustainability of tourism development at a destination (Lee, 2013; Nicholas et al., 2009). Several studies have highlighted the effects of community residents' positive perceptions on the way in which they promote and support a tourism destination (Saufi et al., 2013; Walpole and Goodwin, 2001). Therefore, sustainable tourism development is heavily dependent on the goodwill of local communities, their support, and their involvement in related activities and programs (Gursoy et al., 2002).

3.3. *Perceived Positive Social Effects*

Several researchers have identified various social effects of tourism development, both positive and negative, on destination communities (Butler, 1974; Kim, 2013; Lee, 2013; Yang et al., 2013). Positive social effects include improvements in social services, transportation and recreation facilities, cross-cultural communication, and quality of life (Kim et al, 2013). Nillahut (2010) identifies positive effects such as improvement in the quality of life, positive change in values and customs, promotion of cultural exchange with others cultures to build harmony with one another, greater tolerance of social differences, and increasing facilities for visitors. These facilities, while intended primarily for visiting tourists, benefit residents by strengthening and adding vitality to the community through events and celebrations. Tourism is a force for peace that brings understanding and facilitates cultural exchange between local residents and tourists.

According to Brunt and Courtney (1999), the social effects of tourism allude to the effects that tourists have on the quality of life of host communities. This definition is supported by Sherwood (2007), who devised a measure of the social effects of tourism based on quality of life. Quality of life is a concept that defines the state of human life. Campbell, Converse, and Rodgers (1976) define quality of life as the degree of well-being, satisfaction, and standard of living. Tourism creates employment and, therefore, contributes to the income of local communities. Through job creation and income generation, tourism brings economic benefits to host communities; thereby improving local people's quality of life as the economic benefits of tourist give the financial means to access modern facilities in the form of goods and services (Kim et al, 2013; Rahman, 2010). Moreover, tourism brings many opportunities to upgrade facilities, such as outdoor recreation facilities, parks, and roads. Tovar and Lockwood (2008) acknowledged that the increased availability of recreation and entertainment facilities in Australia is a benefit attributable to tourism.

Tourism development in Langkawi, Malaysia, has encouraged the government to increase the capacity of local services (e.g. police, fire, medical, and utilities) that they might offer their services for the benefit of not only tourists, but also local residents (Shariff and Tahir, 2003). Jashveer et al. (2011) notes that the development of tourism infrastructure benefits the poor by improving tourism-linked local sectors, including transport and communication, water supply, energy, and health.

Tourism can facilitate an understanding of cultural identity and heritage; as well as the revival of arts, local culture, and crafts (Jashveer et al., 2011). Kreag (2001) argues that tourism can help preserve the cultural identity of local communities through the increased the demand by tourists for historical and cultural exhibits. Tourism "contribute[s] to the 'renaissance' of traditional art forms in host societies"

(Haralambopoulos and Pizam, 1996, p. 508). Kim's (2002) study on the effects of tourism indicates that tourism development contributes to the preservation of local culture. He proposes three items to measure the preservation of local culture; encouragement of various cultural activities, support for keeping local culture alive, and preservation of cultural identity and increased pride of residents in local culture.

3.4. Perceived Negative Social Effects

Just as tourism development can positively affect a local community; it can also exert an overall negative effect on the social and cultural aspects of a community (Andereck et al., 2005). Tourism development can adversely affect the value systems and manners of the host community by affecting the identity of indigenous people, whose way of life changes because of the effects of tourism on their community structure, family relationships, morality, and ceremonies (Nillahut, 2010). Similarly, tourism development can be the catalyst for cultural clashes; bring to the fore differences between religious, ethnic, and cultural groups; highlighting disparities in the values and lifestyle of different communities; draw attention to differing levels of economic prosperity, and language differences which can cause conflict among community members (Nillahut, 2010). Tourism development can also physically affect a host community by putting a strain on natural resources such as water, causing environmental degradation, increasing energy demands, and increasing the costs associated with the use of community infrastructure (Nillahut, 2010). Finally, tourism development can result in ethical or moral problems for the local community with increased alcoholism, gambling, drugs, prostitution, and other crimes which degrade the well-being of the community (Nillahut, 2010).

Kim (2002) suggests that overcrowding and congestion is a common problem for tourist destinations, and such congestion often results in commuter and traffic woes. Rothman (1978) notes that residents often curtailed their otherwise routine activities during the peak tourism season due to the congestion or overcrowding. Liu and Var (1986) report that Hawaiian residents experience crippling overcrowding during the peak tourism seasons. Similarly, Tyrrell (1984) found that Rhode Island residents endure heavy roads congestion, difficulty with finding car parking spaces, and overcrowded shopping areas as a result of tourism.

According to Schaeffer (2009), crime is the violation of criminal law for which governmental authorities apply formal penalties. Crime represents a deviation from formal social norms administered by the state. Per Wall and Mathieson (2006), a tourism destination's prevalence of crime is influenced by the presence of criminal activity in the area, the destination area's stage of development, and the proximity of the tourist zone. Tourists are often cash-laden, carrying large amounts of money to spend at tourist

attractions, thereby representing targets of opportunity for crimes such as theft and robbery at tourist destinations. Crimes are often associated with rowdy behavior and drug abuse (Deery et al., 2012). Akama and Kieti (2007) observed that tourism development is often associated with an increase in prostitution. Similarly, Park and Stokowski (2009) and Sharma et al. (2008) found that tourism has a significant effect on rates of prostitution and sexual permissiveness. In Liberia, Costa Rica, respondents commented on a series of social problems that they attributed directly or indirectly to tourism and noted the increased presence of prostitution in their community in line with tourism development (Matarrita-Cascante, 2010).

4. METHODOLOGY

To examine the social effects of tourism development on the local community, a questionnaire was developed outlining both the positive and negative impact of tourism. Questionnaire items focused primarily on the social dimension of the community and the impact of tourism development; items having been identified in the previous literature (Andereck et al., 2005, 2007; Diedrich and Garcia-Buades, 2009; Gursoy et al., 2002; Haley et al., 2005; Hashimoto et al., 2002; Jashveer et al., 2011; Lankford and Howard, 1994; Nillahut, 2010; Oppermann et al., 1999; Park and Stowkowski, 2009; Sharma et al., 2008).

Question items were answered on a five-point Likert scale, with 1 denoting “strongly disagree” and 5 “strongly agree.” The respondent profile inquired as to age, gender, and education level. The survey was conducted at tourist attractions near Kinabalu National Park namely Kampung Kinasaraban, Kampung Mesilau, and Kundasang town.

The sampling frame consisted of local communities near the predetermined sampling areas within the vicinity of Kinabalu National Park.

Respondents were selected based on their contribution to tourism activities and were identified through the recommendation of local authorities, particularly managing parks in Sabah. The respondents included mountain guides and porters, service staff, and hospitality-related workers. Table 1 summarizes the sampling frame of the study.

TABLE 1 - SAMPLING FRAME

Method	Population	Distributed Questionnaires	Response Rate	Valid Responses
Survey	3822	450	401 (89.1%)	378 (83.5%)

5. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Most respondents (see Table 2) were aged 21 – 30 years (n=120 or 31.7%). Otherwise, respondents were aged 31 – 40 (n=92 or 24.3%), 41 – 50 (n=79 or 20.9%), or 51 years and above (n=64 or 16.9%). Most respondents (n=258 or 68.3%) had up to a secondary level of education, whereas others had completed either a diploma/certificate level of education (n=73 or 25.1%), degree (n=23 or 6.1%), or had no formal education at all (n=24, or 6.3%).

TABLE 2 - PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	146	38.6
Female	232	61.4
Age		
18–20	23	6.1
21–30	120	31.7
31–40	92	24.3
41–50	79	20.9
50 and Above	64	16.9
Level of Education		
No Formal Education	24	6.3
Primary School	52	13.8
Secondary School	206	54.5
Certificate/Diploma	73	19.3
Degree	23	6.1

As indicated in Table 3, most of the respondents (n=258 or 68.5%) in this study worked in the tourism sector, with only 31.5% working outside the tourism sector. Of those respondents working in tourism, the majority had been involved in the tourism sector for 1 – 10 years (52.1%), 11 – 20 years (9.8%), 21 – 30 years (5.3%), and 31 – 40 years (1.1%).

Most respondents (21.7%) did not state their work before being working in the tourism sector. However, 22.2% of respondents indicated that they were previously self-employed, 18.8% had worked been farmers, and the remaining 6.6% were formerly government employees.

Most of the respondents, as indicated in Table 4, agreed with the positive effects of tourism. The highest mean value was for the statement, “tourism increases their pride in national culture” ($\bar{X} = 4.24$), followed by “increases residents’ pride in the local community culture” ($\bar{X} = 4.05$), “encourages a variety of cultural activities” ($\bar{X} = 3.98$), “improved infrastructure, such as roads, hospitals, schools, parks, and restaurants” ($\bar{X} = 3.88$), “increased quality of life” ($\bar{X} = 3.77$), “increase in the availability

of recreation opportunities in local community" ($\bar{X} = 3.73$), and "tourism improves my relationship with my family and community" ($\bar{X} = 3.65$).

TABLE 3 - INVOLVEMENT IN TOURISM SECTOR

Questions	Responses	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Involvement in tourism sector	Yes	258	68.5
	No	120	31.5
How many years	1-10	197	52.1
	11-20	37	9.8
	21-30	20	5.3
	31-40	4	1.1
Type of job before	Farmer	71	18.8
	Businessman/self-employed	80	21.2
	Government employees	25	6.6
	Others	82	21.7

By contrast, the findings show an associated low mean value for negative social effect indicators from the perspective of respondents. Therefore, the respondents do not agree with the negative social effects of tourism. The lowest mean value belonged to the statement, "tourism increases crime rate in the local community in Kundasang" ($\bar{X} = 1.99$), followed by "tourism produces negative effects, such as crime, drug use, and prostitution in the local community" ($\bar{X} = 2.18$), "tourism weakens social bonds and family structure" ($\bar{X} = 2.63$), and "tourism causes congestion and is unpleasant to the local community" ($\bar{X} = 2.73$). In short, most of the respondents agreed with the positive effects of tourism rather than the negative effects.

TABLE 4 - RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF SOCIAL EFFECTS

Effects	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. Positive Effects		
a) Improved infrastructure, such as roads, hospitals, schools, parks, and restaurants	3.88	1.073
b) Tourism development increases the availability of recreation opportunities in local community	3.73	1.081
c) Tourism increases quality of life	3.77	.883
d) Tourism increases my pride in our national culture	4.24	0.764
e) Tourism increases residents' pride in the local community culture	4.05	0.848
f) Tourism encourages a variety of cultural activities	3.98	0.868
g) Tourism improves my relationship with my family and community	3.65	.940
2. Negative Effects		
a) Tourism produces negative effects, such as crime, drug use, and prostitution, in the local community	2.18	1.173
b) Tourism causes congestion and is unpleasant to the local community	2.73	1.219
c) Tourism increases crime in the local community	1.99	1.035
d) Tourism weakens social bonds and family structure	2.63	1.349

5. DISCUSSIONS

This paper investigates the attitudes of the local community toward the perceived social effects of tourism on their lives and community in the vicinity of Kinabalu National Park, including Kampung Kinasaraban, Kampung Mesilau, and Kundasang city. Due to the ever increasing number of tourists visiting the area, many local people have sought work in the tourism sector in fields as diverse as transportation, handicraft production and sales, accommodation provision, food and beverage, and other services to meet the needs and demands of tourists. Residents now come into contact with tourists on an almost daily basis and the increasing number of tourists has provided an opportunity to further develop Kinabalu National Park as a tourism destination community.

The findings of this study indicate that tourism has significantly increased residents' pride in both their national and local culture and encourages the enactment of cultural activities, the positive effects of tourism having the highest mean scores. The positive effect relationship identified in this study can help the local community protect and preserve their culture (McGeHee et al., 2002; Nilllahut, 2010). This relationship also indirectly facilitates the development of the tourism industry by outlining the local community's context for welcoming tourists as a means of preserving and showcasing their culture. Kim (2002) observes that tourism development contributes to the preservation of local cultures. Several items addressed the issue of preserving the local culture, including encouraging various cultural activities, keeping local culture alive, maintaining cultural identity, and increasing residents' pride in their local culture (Andereck et al., 2007; Gursoy et al., 2002; Kim, 2002).

Infrastructure improvements at Kundasang, including roads, hospitals, schools, parks, and restaurants, accrued the second highest mean score. With increased numbers of tourists the demand for services increases, thus additional local services must be provided. This positive effect provides benefits to the local community. This finding supports previous findings that communities benefit from tourism due to subsequent improvements in social infrastructure; such as schools, libraries, health care institutions, and Internet cafés (Jashveer et al., 2011; Mirbabayev and Shagzatova, 2006). Similarly, Wang et al. (2006) emphasize the significant role of tourism development in improving community infrastructure. Therefore, governments are solving two problems at once by upgrading public services for the benefit of tourism, because such activity also benefits the local community.

However, inappropriate tourism development and growth can bring about adverse social effects on the tourist destination, including exposing the local community to behaviors foreign to them and changes in their lifestyles. However, this study finds that most of the respondents did not agree with the negative effects of tourism. Therefore, from the perspective of residents, the results do not confirm the findings of

previous studies (Akama and Kieti, 2007; Kim 2002; Nillahut, 2010) regarding the negative social effects of tourism, such as crime, drugs, and prostitution.

6. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

Tourism is one of the fastest growing sectors of the global economy and the Malaysian tourism sector is no different. Tourism has a significant effect on the economy and livelihoods of those living in destination communities. However, in this study we investigated the social effects of tourism development; how it creates employment and thereby increases the both the income and standard of living of the local community. We found that tourism development in Kinabalu National Park has yielded both positive and negative social effects for the local community, but that the local community believes that the positive effects considerably outweigh the negative.

The gains made through tourism in Kinabalu National Park can be sustained into the future if those who are involved in tourism, together with the central government and local authorities, resolve to remedy the problems hindering tourism development. Such efforts, however, will demand the involvement of the local community in the tourism development process. Moreover, the government also has a role in ensuring that local communities have greater access to the benefits of tourism. To this end, tourism suppliers (e.g. services, transportation, food and beverage, and accommodation) can contribute by maximizing local labor employment. With this effort, the local community can realize the economic advantages of tourism and indirectly enhance their income, knowledge, and quality of life. Local community participation is an important part of this process; helping people protect and conserve their community and its resources as a tourist attraction. Moreover, such participation can help overcome many of the negative social effects associated with tourism development.

In conclusion, local authorities should determine the scope of the tourism development and identify a carrying capacity congruent with the tourist destination. Local cultures and native lifestyles should be preserved, and these initiatives should come from the local community itself because they are the ones who will experience the effects of such development. However, the government might still formulate plans intended to mitigate the burden of tourism on locals and to leverage the development of tourism in Kinabalu National Park, thereby enable locals to lead prosperous and harmonious lives.

7. LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

This study explored the perceived positive and negative impact of tourism development by host residents of villages in the vicinity of Kinabalu National Park. To this end, a series of descriptive

statistical methods were employed and findings discussed by comparing of mean values. Inferential statistics might extend this study further. Also, other advanced analytic methods for examining the social impact positive and negative effects on sustainable tourism development might have yielded more information. Moreover, further study of the perceived positive and negative impacts of tourism in Kinabalu National Park might identify additional factors contributing to the sustainable development of Kinabalu National Park as a WHS.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This project was funded through a research grant from the Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysia under the Long-Term Research Grant Scheme 2011 [LRGS Grant No. JPT.S (BPKI)2000/09/01/015Jld4(67)].

REFERENCES

- Akama, J. S. and Kieti, D. (2007), "Tourism and socio-economic development in developing countries: A case study of Mombasa Resort in Kenya", *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Vol. 15 No. 6, pp. 735-748.
- Andereck, K. L., Valentine, K. M., Knopf, R. C. and Vogt, C. A. (2005), "Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 32 No. 4, pp. 1056-1076.
- Andereck, K. L., Valentine, K. M., Vogt, C. A. and Knopf, R. C. (2007), "A cross-cultural analysis of tourism and quality of life perceptions", *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Vol. 15 No. 5, pp. 483-502.
- Backhaus, N. (2003), "'Non-place jungle': The construction of authenticity in National parks of Malaysia", *Indonesia and the Malay world*, Vol. 31 No. 89, pp.151-160.
- Bradshaw, T. K. (2008), "The post-place community: Contributions to the debate about the definition of community", *Community Development*, Vol. 39 No. 1, pp. 5-16.
- Brohman, J. (1996), "New directions in tourism for third world development", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 23 No. 1, pp. 48-70.
- Brunt, P. and Courtney, P. (1999), "Host perceptions of sociocultural impacts", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 493-515.
- Butler, R. (1974), "Tourism as an agent of social change", *Annals of Tourism Research*, No. 2, pp. 100-111.
- Butler, R. (2006), *The Tourism Area Life Cycle*, Channel View Publications, Bristol, UK.
- Campbell, A., Converse, P. E. and Rodgers, W. L. (1976), *The Quality of American Life: Perceptions, Evaluations, and Satisfactions*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, NY.
- Claiborne, P. (2010), *Community Participation in Tourism Development and the Value of Social Capital - The case of Bastimentos, Bocas del Toro, Panamá*, University of Gothenburg, Göteborg, Sweden.
- Deery, M., Jago, L. and Fredline, L. (2012), "Rethinking social impacts of tourism research: A new research agenda", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 33 No. 1, pp. 64-73.

- Diedrich, A. and García-Buades, E. (2009), "Local perceptions of tourism as indicators of destination decline", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 512-521.
- Eagles, P. F. (2002), "Trends in park tourism: economics, finance and management", *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 132-153.
- Godfrey, K. and Clarke, J. (2000), *The Tourism Development Handbook: A Practical Approach to Planning and Marketing*, Continuum, London, UK.
- Gursoy, D., Jurowski, C. and Uysal, M. (2002), "Resident attitudes: A structural modeling approach", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 79-105.
- Haley, A. J., Snaith, T. and Miller, G. (2005), "The social impacts of tourism a case study of Bath, UK", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol 32 No. 3, pp. 647-668.
- Hall, C. M. and Boyd, S. (2005), *Nature-Based Tourism in Peripheral Areas: Development or Disaster?*, Channel View Publications, Bristol, UK.
- Hall, C. M. and Page, S. J. (2003), *The Geography of Tourism and Recreation: Environment, Place and Space*, Routledge, London, UK.
- Haralambopoulos, N. and Pizam, A. (1996), "Perceived impacts of tourism: The case of Samos", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 503-526.
- Hashimoto, A., Sharpley, R. and Telfer, D. (2002), "Tourism and socio cultural development issues", in Sharpley, R. and Telfer, D. (Eds.), *Tourism and Development: Concepts and Issues*, Channel View Publications, Bristol, UK, pp. 202-230.
- Hellenic Tourism Organization (2000), *Design of Pilot Actions for the Development of Ecological Tourism*, Hellenic Ministry of Development, Athens, Greece.
- Hong, C. G. and Mohd Yusoff, M. (2010), "Tourism Management in Kinabalu Park. An Analysis of nature of goods in meeting sustainable tourism", paper presented at the International Conference on Business, Economics and Tourism Management (CBETM 2010), 26-28 February, Singapore.
- Jaafar, M., Kayat, K., Tangit, T. M. and Yacob, M. F. (2013), "Nature-based rural tourism and its economic benefits: A case study of Kinabalu National Park", *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, Vol. 5 No. 4, pp. 342-352.
- Jackson, L. A. (2008), "Residents' perceptions of the impacts of special event tourism", *Journal of Place Management and Development*, Vol. 1 No. 3, pp. 240-255.
- Jashveer, H., Boopen, S., Kesseven, P. and Vinesh, S. R. (2011), *TIPS Small Grant Scheme Research Paper Series 2011: Tourism Development and Local Community*, University of Mauritius, Moka, Mauritius.
- Jurowski, C., Uysal, M. and Williams, D. R. (1997), "A theoretical analysis of host community resident reactions to tourism", *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 36 No. 2, pp. 3-11.
- Khalifah, Z. and Tahir, S. (1997), "Malaysia: Tourism in perspective", in Go, F. M. and Jenkins, C. L. (Eds.), *Tourism and Economic Development in Asia and Australasia*, Cassell, London, UK, pp. 176-196.
- Kim, K. (2002), *The Effects of Tourism Impacts upon Quality of Life of Residents in the Community*, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA.

- Kim, K., Uysal, M. and Sirgy, M. J. (2013), "How does tourism in a community impact the quality of life of community residents?", *Tourism Management*, No. 36, pp. 527-540.
- Kozak, M. (2002), "Comparative analysis of tourist motivations by nationality and destinations", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 221-232.
- Kreag, G. (2001), *The Impacts of Tourism*, University of Minnesota Press, Minnesota.
- Lankford, S. V. and Howard, D. R. (1994), "Developing a tourism impact attitude scale", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 121-139.
- Lee, T. H. (2013), "Influence analysis of community resident support for sustainable tourism development", *Tourism Management*, No. 34, pp. 37-46.
- Liu, J. C. and Var, T. (1986), "Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts in Hawaii", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 193-214.
- MacDonald, R. and Jolliffe, L. (2003), "Cultural rural tourism: Evidence from Canada", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 307-322.
- Matarrita-Cascante, D. (2010), "Beyond growth: Reaching tourism-led development", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp. 1141-1163.
- McGehee, N. G., Andereck, K. L. and Vogt, C. A. (2002), "An examination of factors influencing resident attitudes toward tourism in twelve Arizona communities", in *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual Travel and Tourism Research Association Conference, Arlington, June 23-26, 2002*, Sage, Arlington, VA.
- McIntosh, R. W., Goeldner, C. R. and Ritchie, J. B. (1995), *Tourism: Principles, Practices, Philosophies*, John Wiley and Sons, Hoboken, NJ.
- Mirbabayev, B. and Shagzatova, M. (2006), *The Economic and Social Impact of Tourism*, National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies, Tokyo, Japan.
- Shariff, N. M. and Tahir, S. (2003), "Residents' attitudes toward impacts of tourism: A case study of Langkawi, Malaysia", *Malaysian Management Journal*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 13-24.
- Nicholas, L. N., Thapa, B. and Ko, Y. J. (2009), "Residents' perspectives of A World Heritage Site: The Pitons Management Area, St. Lucia", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 36 No. 3, pp. 390-412.
- Nillahut, W. (2010), *Local Resident's Perception Towards Impacts From Tourism Development in Phuket, Thailand*, Doctor of Philosophy, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang, Malaysia.
- Oppermann, M. (1999), "Sex tourism", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 251-266.
- Park, M. and Stokowski, P. A. (2009), "Social disruption theory and crime in rural communities: Comparisons across three levels of tourism growth", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 30 No. 6, pp. 905-915.
- Pizam, A. and Milman, A. (1984), "The social impacts of tourism", *Industry and Environment*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 11-14.
- Rahman, M. M. (2010), *Exploring the Socio-Economic Impacts of Tourism: A Case Study of Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh*, Doctor of Philosophy, University of Wales, Cardiff, UK.
- Rothman, R. A. (1978), "Residents and transients: community reaction to seasonal visitors", *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 8-13.

- Saufi, A., O'Brien, D. and Wilkins, H. (2013). "Inhibitors to host community participation in sustainable tourism development in developing countries", *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Vol. 22 No. 5, pp. 801-820.
- Schaeffer, R. (2009), "The Audacity of Compromise: The UN Security Council and the Pre-conditions to the Exercise of Jurisdiction by the ICC with Regard to the Crime of Aggression", *International Criminal Law Review*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 411-433.
- Sharma, B., Dyer, P., Carter, J. and Gursoy, D. (2008), "Exploring residents' perceptions of the social impacts of tourism on the Sunshine Coast, Australia", *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 288-311.
- Sharpley, R. (1994), *Tourism, Tourists and Society*, ELM Publications, Huntingdon, UK.
- Sharpley, R. (2014), "Host perceptions of tourism: A review of the research", *Tourism Management*, No. 42, pp. 37-49.
- Sherwood, P. (2007), *A Triple Bottom Line Evaluation of the Impact of Special Events: The Development of Indicators*, Doctor of Philosophy, Victoria University, Melbourne, Australia.
- Singh, S., Timothy, D. J. and Dowling, R. K. (2003), *Tourism in Destination Communities*, CABI Publishing, Oxford, UK.
- Stansfield, C. (2006), *The rejuvenation of Atlantic City: The resort cycle recycles. The Tourism Area Life Cycle: Applications and Modifications*, Channelview Publications, Bristol, UK.
- Tovar, C. and Lockwood, M. (2008), "Social impacts of tourism: an Australian regional case study", *International Journal of Tourism Research*, Vol. 10 No. 4, pp. 365-378.
- Tyrrell, T. J. (1984), "A survey of attitudes toward tourism growth in Rhode Island", *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 22-33.
- UNWTO (2006), *Tourism Highlights: Overview International Tourism*, World Tourism Organization, Madrid, Spain.
- Wall, G. and Mathieson, A. (2006), *Tourism: Changes, Impacts, and Opportunities*, Pearson Education, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Walpole, M. J. and Goodwin, H. J. (2001), "Local attitudes towards conservation and tourism around Komodo National Park, Indonesia", *Environmental Conservation*, Vol. 28 No. 02, pp. 160-166.
- Wang, F-C., Hung, W-T. and Shang, J-K. (2006), "Measuring the cost efficiency of international tourist hotels in Taiwan", *Tourism Economics*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 65-85.
- Wang, Y. A. and Pfister, R. E. (2008), "Residents' attitudes toward tourism and perceived personal benefits in a rural community", *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 47 No. 1, pp. 84-93.
- Wight, P. A. (1993), "Sustainable ecotourism: balancing economic, environmental and social goals within an ethical framework", *Journal of Tourism Studies*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 54-66.
- WTO (2008), *Development Indicators Online*, World Bank, Washington D.C.
- WTTC (2010), *Travel and Tourism Economic Impact of Laos*, World Travel and Tourism Council, London, UK.
- Yang, J., Ryan, C. and Zhang, L. (2013), "Social conflict in communities impacted by tourism", *Tourism Management*, No. 35, pp. 82-93.